

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29, and 30 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,157,720 (“Yoshiura”) in view of United States Patent No. 5,930,398 (“Watney”) and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,505,299 (“Zeng”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Interview Summary

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Andrew Nalven participated in a telephonic interview on November 7, 2006, during which Mr. Eiferman presented the remarks below. Examiner Nalven stated that these remarks appeared to distinguish the present application from the cited references as necessary to overcome the rejections of record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,157,720 (“Yoshiura”) in view of United States Patent No. 5,930,398 (“Watney”) and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,505,299 (“Zeng”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent claims 1, 9, 14, 19, 24 and 29 recite that a content key is *supplied* by a decryption or encryption element to a decompression or compression element. Yoshiura does not teach or suggest this feature. Rather, Yoshiura discloses that a Work Key 116 is stored in a separate memory location 111 that is accessed by both a decryption element and a decompression element (See Fig. 1). Thus, by requiring the key to be supplied from one element to another (rather than being stored in a separate memory location which may not be sufficiently secured) the system of the present invention provides greater security than the system of Yoshiura. Watney and Zeng similarly fail to teach or suggest this feature.

DOCKET NO.: 148565.1 / MSFT-0249
Application No.: 09/892,367
Office Action Dated: September 8, 2006

PATENT

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 14, 19, 24 and 29 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 148565.1 / MSFT-0249
Application No.: 09/892,367
Office Action Dated: September 8, 2006

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Date: December 7, 2006

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre, 12th Floor
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439